

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the courtesy of the Examiner for the interview which was conducted by telephone on April 26, 2004. During the interview, the claims were discussed in relation to the cited art, particularly in view of the recited language of claim 6, which states:

said interface unit is operable to enter a *reset wait state . . . only after receiving a response to the bus reset signal from each of the partner communication devices.*

Similar recitations appear in claims 16 and 17. However, no agreement was reached during the interview to allow the claims at this time.

The cited art fails to show the above recited feature. As discussed in the interview, no passage of *Okawa* or other reference has been pointed out by the Examiner which describes a device that is operable to enter the *reset wait state only after receiving a response to the bus reset signal from each of the partner communication devices.*

The claimed embodiments of the invention are described in the specification in relation to a problem of the short bus reset of the IEEE-1394A draft specification, as described at pg. 11, ¶ [0017] through pg. 13, ¶ [0022]. According to the IEEE-1394A specification, the node initiating the short bus reset proceeds to the bus initialization phase R1 after remaining in bus initialization phase R0 for a predetermined period of time. Thus, in IEEE-1394A, the initiating node does not wait for responses to be received from each partner communication device before entering a reset wait state. This caused a problem with partner communication devices that are connected by long length cables. In such case, the response to the bus reset signal from the partner communication device might not come until well after the expected time for its receipt. In the particular example

shown and described with respect to FIG. 6 (see center of drawing), the initiating node (node b) transitions through bus initialization phases R0 and R1 and into a Tree Identification Phase by the time the bus reset signal is received from node a, located at the end of a longer length cable. In such case, the initiating node (node b) cannot complete the operation and is required to begin bus reset signaling all over again.

By contrast, in the invention claimed in claim 6, the interface unit is operable to enter a reset wait state, *only after receiving a response* to the bus reset signal from each of the partner communication devices. An example of such operation is illustrated in FIGS. 29-30 (See, *inter alia*, operations of node b shown at center of FIG. 30). A fuller description of such operation is described in the Specification at p. 48, ¶[0130] through p. 49 ¶[0132]. These features are neither taught nor suggested by *Okawa*.

Applicant has reviewed *Okawa* and is unable to determine the basis for the rejection of claims 6, 16 and 17. Unfortunately, in addition to claims 6, 16 and 17, as discussed in the interview, the Office Action does not point out the portions of *Okawa* that purportedly teach that the response awaited from each partner communication device is a bus reset signal (claim 7), and that the transmitter (of the interface unit) is operable to transmit an idle signal after passage of the predetermined period of time (claim 8). Accordingly, these claims are independently distinguished from *Okawa*.

Moreover, the Applicants are unable to understand the nature of the "best mode" rejection. The claimed invention is disclosed in the application. The Examiner has not alleged that the Applicants have withheld subject matter from the application needed to describe the Applicants' best mode for practicing the invention. The mere fact that a full description has been

provided of the environment within which the invention operates does not indicate a failure to describe the best mode.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Daryl K. Neff
Daryl K. Neff

Registration No.: 38,253
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

490180_1